Exhibit A

	TRIAL COL	URT OF MASSACHUSETTS		10 0000//
CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET		COURT DEPARTMENT	_ DOCKET NO.	12-0377H
	COUNTY	SUFFOLK		
	OF			
ar a samual (O) E dia a Dia a Is		DEFENDANT(S)Stark	ucks Corpora	ition
PLAINTIFF(S)Erika Black		DEPENDANT (5) Ctark	doko oo.po.o	
				Jahren City/State/Zin
Type Plaintiff's Attorney name, Add Phone Number and E	lress, City/State/ 3BO#	/ZIp Type Defendant's <i>F</i>	Attorney Name, A Phone Number (If	ddress, City/State/Zip Known)
nannon Liss-Riordan, BBO #640716, Hill	ary Schwab, BBC			
66029, Brant Casavant, BBO #672614, 79565, Lichten & Liss-Riordan, P.C., 10	Claret Vargas, D	et		
th Floor, Boston, MA 02114, 617-994-58	0 Cambridge out	501,		
MI Floor, Boston, MA 02114, 017 001 00				
munn on	A CONTON AND T	RACK DESIGNATION (Se	e reverse side)	
·		ACK DESIGNATION (S	ie reverse side)	S THIS A JURY CASE?
CODE NO. TYPE OF ACTION (s		1CIL	-	_
			(િ] Yes 🤚] No
B99 Other Tort (specify) - Fast T	rack		·	
The following is a full, itemized and	l detailed state	ment of the facts on wh	ich plaintiff re	lies to determine
noney damages. For this form, dis	regard double	or treble damage claim	s; indicate sin	gle damages only.
noney damages. For this form, dis	regura acabie		,	
		DT CLAIMS		F-5 5-3
	1U (Attach additi	<u>PRT CLAIMS</u> onal sheets as necessary	v)	
A. Documented medical expense	to date:	onal sheets as necessar.		- 岩和 -
1 Total hospital expenses				\$
2. Total doctor expenses		·.		
3. Total chiropractic expens	es			\$
4. Total physical therapy ex 5. Total other expenses (des	(penses			\$ -
5. Total other expenses (des	ici ibe)		Subtot	al S
B. Documented lost wages and co	ompensation to	date		\$
				3
D. Reasonably anticipated future	e medical expe	nses		<u>~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ </u>
Documented property damag Reasonably anticipated future Reasonably anticipated lost w Other documented items of da	ages and comp	ensation to date		Ψ
				\$
G. Brief description of plaintiff's	injury, includi	ing nature and extent o	f injury (descr	ibe)
	3 0 7			
			To	otal \$
	CONT	TRACT CLAIMS		•,
	(Attach additi	ional sheets as necessar	y)	
Provide a detailed description of cl	aim(s):			
			1	
				TOTAL \$
PLEASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBE	D NAME AND	COUNTY, ANY RELATED	ACTION PEND	ING IN THE SUPERIOR
PLEASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBE	A, NAME AND	Journal Indiana		
COURT DEPARTMENT				
"I hereby certify that I have complied with the	requirements of R	ule 5 of the Supreme Judicial C	ourt Uniform Rule	s on Dispute Resolution (SJC
Rule 1:18) requiring that I provide my clients	with information at	Dont contr-confiected dispute 1	esolution services a	14 0.00 0.00
advantages and disadvantages of the various i	nethods."	Riordar	1/2/	12 10
Signature of Attorney of Record	NOL/MA	KNO WINCE	Date: 1/ 50	/ COIX
A.O.S.C. 3-2007	V		•	•

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss.	Superior Court Civil Action No.	
ERICKA BLACK and all others similarly situated,)	12-0377H
Plaintiffs,)	3 ~
V.)	
STARBUCKS CORPORATION,)	
Defendant.)))	
COMPLA	JINT	龍 8 日

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a class action challenging Starbucks Corporation's policy of distributing to shift supervisors proceeds of tips left by customers. This practice violates Massachusetts law. The above-named plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all similarly situated employees, namely all individuals who have worked as baristas at a Starbucks store in Massachusetts since March 18, 2011. Plaintiffs allege that Starbucks' policy of including shift supervisors in its tip pool violates the Massachusetts Tips Law, Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 152A. In this action, the named plaintiff seeks restitution for herself and all other similarly situated

A prior case brought against Starbucks raising this same allegation was certified as a class action for the period of time three years prior to the filing of that complaint, until the Court's class certification order, March 18, 2011. The court in that case ruled that Starbucks' policy of allowing shift supervisors to receive a share of the tip pool violated Massachusetts law. See Matamoros et al. v. Starbucks Corporation, 2011 WL 1044654, *8 (D. Mass. Feb. 8, 2011), adopted by 2011 WL 1002740 (D. Mass. Mar. 18, 2011). Since Starbucks has not changed its policy, this case has been brought for the class period beginning March 18, 2011.

employees who did not receive all tips to which they are entitled to have received under the law.

II. PARTIES

- Plaintiff Ericka Black is an adult resident of Boston, Massachusetts.
 Ms. Black was employed as a Starbucks barista in Massachusetts from approximately July 2010 until August 2011.
- 3. This is a class action that the above-named plaintiff brings on her own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, namely all other individuals who work, or have since March 18, 2011, worked, as baristas for Starbucks in Massachusetts.
- 4. Defendant Starbucks Corporation is an international corporation that has stores that sell coffee and other beverages, as well as food and other products, around the world, including in Massachusetts.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 5. Starbucks patrons leave a substantial amount of tips in containers located in all Starbucks stores.
- 6. Starbucks distributes the proceeds of this tip money to its employees.

 The employees who receive proceeds of these tips include shift supervisors.
- 7. Shift supervisors have managerial responsibilities, including supervising baristas, opening and closing stores, opening and closing cash registers, and administrative work.

8. Because a portion of patrons' tips is distributed to shift supervisors, Starbucks baristas have not received the total proceeds of tips that are required to be paid to them.

COUNT I

MASSACHUSETTS TIPS LAW

Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, violates Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 152A. This claim is brought pursuant to Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 150.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Court certify this case as a class action and order on behalf of the class restitution for all tips that have been distributed to shift supervisors.

Respectfully submitted,

ERICKA BLACK and all others similarly situated,

By their attorneys,

Shannon Liss-Riordan, BBO #640716

Hillary Schwab, BBO #666029 Brant Casavant, BBO # 672614

Claret Vargas, BBO #679565

LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.

100 Cambridge Street – 20th Floor

Boston, MA 02114

(617) 994 - 5800

DATED: January 30, 2012

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

SUFFOLK, ss.



SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT CIVIL ACTION

No. 12-0	No. 12-03//		
Erika Black, and all others similarly	, Plaintiff(s)		
situated,			
V.	•		
Starbucks Corporation	, Defendant(s)		

SUMMONS
Starbucks Corporation, c/o Registered Agent Prentice-Hall Corporation System, Inc. 84 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109

To the above-named Defendant:

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Shannon Liss-Riordan, Esq., Hillary Schwab, Esq., Brant Casavant, Esq., and Claret Vargas, Esq., Lichten & Liss-Riordan, P.C. plaintiff's attorney, whose address is 100 Cambridge St., 20th Fl, Boston, MA 02114 an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You are also required to file your answer to the complaint in the office of the Clerk of this court at Boston either before service upon plaintiff's attorney or within a reasonable time thereafter.

Unless otherwise provided by Rule 13(a), your answer must state as a counterclaim any claim which you may have against the plaintiff which arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the plaintiff's claim or you will thereafter be barred from making such claim in any other action.

Witness,	Barbara J. Rouse, Esquire, at Boston, the <u>Twenty-Sixth</u>	day of
April	, in the year of our Lord two thousand	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••

Michael Joseph Donovan

Clerk/Magistrate

NOTES

- 1. This summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 2. When more than one defendant is involved, the names of all defendants should appear in the caption. If a separate summons is used for each defendant, each should be addressed to the particular defendant.
- 3. TO PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY: PLEASE CIRCLE TYPE OF ACTION INVOLVED
 (1) TORT —(2) MOTOR VEHICLE TORT —(3) CONTRACT —(4) EQUITABLE RELIEF —(5) OTHER

	Case :	1:12-cv-10	961-NMG	Document 1-1	Filed 05/29/	/12 Page 7 (of 7
		(AFFIX FILING STAMP HERE)	SUMMONS (Mass. R. Civ. P. 4)	Starbucks Corporation , Deft(s).	v .	OF THE TRIAL COURT CIVIL ACTION No. Erika Black, and all others similarly situated	Commonwealth of Massachusetts SUFFOLK, ss. SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT
				··		•	
102,	£						
	DEKEI	SAED ON ELENDVAL	COLA ZEI ICE ON DE	SINYT YND ON ON WYKE SEKA	OA LHE OBIG VCE DVLE KG 22 SEBAEB: •	PLEASE PLA	'A'B'
					102,		eted: